EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT OFFICE

FRANCISCO X. FERNANDEZ, : EEOC Hearing No

Complainant,

170-A3-8006X

vs.

JOHN ASHCROFT, ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

: Agency Case No. D-02-3654

Agency

MONDAY, JUNE 9, 2003 PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Hearing, taken at the Department of Drug Enforcement Administration, Philadelphia Field Division, Federal Building, 6th & Arch Streets, 10th Floor, commencing at 1:15 p.m., before Denise Weller, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

> MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 735 8th STREET, S.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003 (202) 546-6666

1

	2
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
4	BY: LYNN L. GOLDSTEIN, ESQUIRE ADELE H. ODEGARD, ESQUIRE
5	Office of Chief Counsel 2401 Jefferson Davis Highway
6	Alexandria, VA 22301 (202) 307-8040
7	Attorney for the Agency
8	DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION
9	BY: FRANCISCO FERNANDEZ 1012 College Road
10	Suite 205 Dover, DE 19904
11	(302) 672-6383
12	
13	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT OFFICE
14	BY: DONNA NUTTER RODWELL Administrative Judge
15	The Bourse 21 South 5th Street
16	Suite 400 Philadelphia, PA 19106-2515
17	(215) 440-2808
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 735 8th STREET, S.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003 (202) 546-6666

		3
1	INDEX	
2		
3	WITNESSES	PAGE
_		
4		
5	DAVID ZON	19
6	MARVIN MAILEY	28
7	FRANCISCO FERNANDEZ	67, 173
8	JOHN BROWN	93
9	JOHN MCCARTY	190
10	WALTER MORRISON	264
11		
12	EXHIBITS_(Admitted)	
13		
14	Agency 1 through 13	
15	Agency 16	
16		
17	Complainant C1-A through C-3	
18	Complainant 7	
19	Complainant 13 through C-15	
20	Complaintant 18 through C-20	
21	Complainant 22 through 24	
22	Complainant 31 and C-32	
23	Complainant 36	
24	Complainant 40	
	MILLER REPORTING CO., INC.	

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 735 8th STREET, S.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003 (202) 546-6666

hearing today. And I approved you as a 1 witness in this case. 2 Do you have any objection, sir, to 3 taking an oath? 4 5 MR. MCCARTY: No. JUDGE RODWELL: Raise your right 6 7 hand, please. 8 JOHN MCCARTY, after having been 9 10 first duly sworn, was examined and testified 11 as follows: 12 JUDGE RODWELL: Thank you, sir. 13 State your name for the record and your 14 current position with the Agency. 15 THE WITNESS: My name is John R. 16 McCarty; M-C-C-A-R-T-Y. My title is special 17 agent. And currently I am assigned as the 18 special agent in charge of the drug 19 enforcement administration office of 20 training located in Quantico, Virginia. 21 22 JUDGE RODWELL: And how long have 23 you been in that position?

24

THE WITNESS: Since June of 2002.

career board meet?

- A. Approximately every four to six weeks.
- 2. And can you give me an estimate as to how many items the career board went over during each meeting?
- A. The career board was broken down.

 The agenda, which was compiled by me at the time, was broken down into four categories. One that handled administrative items, people returning early from tours overseas, hardships, things like that to civilian promotions such as chems getting the next grade level to grade 15 promotions and grade promotions.

It was not uncommon to have a career board that had between 30 and 100 items to be determined on a given day.

- Q. Okay. And as executive secretary,
 what did you do in preparation for a career board
 meeting?
- A. We would go through the actual vacancy announcements that had been announced by the Agency, collate them into those four categories and make sure that the best qualified

lists which were compiled by the office of personnel were given to the career board and then sent out to the agents in charge or the office head who would be responsible for selecting someone to fill those positions.

qualified list from--for the agent's assignment unit and attach biographical data sheets which would give the agent in charge an idea of who the individuals were rather than just a name on a list. They would have an idea of how many--what assignments a person may have, their educational experience, their time on the job. It would have their enter on duty date, things of that nature on it so they can get a better view of the individuals applying for the particular opening.

We would then send this to the agent in charge or office head. They would commonly send back a recommendation list, usually made up of three individuals who they felt had the knowledge, skills and abilities to fill the particular vacancy that they had in their office.

So you said that it would be an office head or SAC recommendation as opposed to a

- A. It's my understanding that, yes, they are.
 - Q. Why are they now being recorded?
- A. I have no idea.

Q. So we have nothing on the record to show documentation wise to show what was discussed? We already went over that, correct? Nothing in the minutes to show what was actually discussed with regard to the positions?

JUDGE RODWELL: I have a question.

I have a question. No, we don't, sir. And

I am saying that because it's already been

asked and answered.

Mr. McCarty, I know you testified that sometimes the career board--that career board members don't always accept the SAC's recommendation. Is that--what is it, is it more common for them to accept the SAC recommendation or not?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is more common for them to accept the SAC recommendation.

However, the career board is mandated to take the Agency's as a whole needs into consideration. Thus, they may make

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 735 8th STREET, S.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003 (202) 546-6666